

### REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on February 23, 2005, and the references cited therewith.

Claim 27 is amended, claims 1-26 were previously canceled, without prejudice; claims 28-46 are added; and as a result, claims 27-46 are now pending in this application.

#### §103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lewis (U.S. 2002/0065752 A1) and further in view of Strobe et al. (U.S. 5,129,057). It is of course fundamental that in order to sustain an obviousness rejection that each and every step or element in the rejected claims must be taught or suggested in the proposed combination of references. Additionally, there must be motivation to achieve any proposed combination of references.

More specifically, Lewis is directed to an integrated financial reporting system. The only mention of a “workflow” in Lewis is in paragraph number 155, where Lewis indicates that a system administrative tool associated with the integrated financial reporting system may be implemented to load balance, backup, and/or recover processing associated with its system. It is not the workflow that is being presented as a workflow diagram having real-time statistics in Lewis. The data presented in Lewis is financial data and that financial data is not associated with a workflow diagram.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Lewis does not teach a workflow and even incorrectly assuming that a financial workflow is taught, that workflow is not associated with transactions of call centers. Such a limitation is now positively recited in Applicants’ amended independent claim 27 and recited in Applicants’ newly added independent claims 34 and 41. In fact, Lewis is directed to consolidating disparate financial information into a single format for subsequent integration and publication. There is no teaching or even a suggestion of a teaching in Lewis where real-time statistics are displayed with a workflow, where that workflow is associated with transactions of a call center.

Stated another way, Lewis performs financial transactions according to a business rule and updates appropriate ledgers accordingly. Each of the references cited by the Examiner for Lewis comports with this interpretation of Lewis. Applicants respectfully assert that Lewis is

incapable of displaying a workflow diagram associated with transactions of a call center and incapable of displaying a workflow diagram with real-time statistics. Lewis is directed to mapping disparate financial information into a common format that can be processed. Lewis does not present workflows and statistics about those workflows.

Applicants also assert that the data presented in Lewis is not statistical data associated with a workflow. The data in Lewis is not data about other data, such as the processing of a workflow; rather, the data is financial information about accounting ledger entries.

Applicants would also like to point out that Strobe is directed to presenting compressed calendar information in an interactive handling system. To view an event description for a calendar entry in Strobe, a mouse is placed over a flashing bar. The information presented in Strobe is not statistics about a workflow.

The proposed combination of Lewis and Strobe does not render Applicants' invention obvious because the proposed combination lacks at least the teaching or the suggestion of a teaching for a workflow associated with transactions of a call center, and the display of statistical information about that workflow.

Applicants also do not believe that one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine Lewis and Strobe in the first instance because Strobe is associated with presenting compressed calendar data and Lewis is associated with integrating disparate financial information into a common format for processing. A combination of Lewis and Strobe would result in an integrated financial system having a calendar feature for viewing compressed calendar entries. Thus, the combination would not change the teachings of either and would not achieve Applicants' invention.

Thus, Applicants respectfully assert that the proposed combination lacks the teachings of the independent claims and cannot be made because one of ordinary skill in the art would not have combined the two references in the manner being proposed by the Examiner.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections be withdrawn and that the claims be allowed.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (408) 278-4041 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

GLEN KAZUMI OKITA ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.

P.O. Box 2938

Minneapolis, MN 55402

(408) 278-4041

Date

May 23, 2005

By

Garth Vivier

Under 37 CFR § 11.9(b)

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 23 day of May, 2005.

Name

Dawn R. Shaw

Signature

Dawn R. Shaw